

DARK **PSYCHOLOGY** **SECRETS**



REAL JEDI MIND TRICKS
on how to Read, Influence and Control
people to get what you want!

EMILIE STANTON

DARK PSYCHOLOGY SECRETS



REAL JEDI MIND TRICKS
on how to Read, Influence and Control
people to get what you want!

EMILIE STANTON

Dark Psychology Secrets

*Real Jedi Mind Tricks on How
to Read, Influence and Control
People
to Get What You Want!*

Emilie STANTON

© Copyright 2020 - All rights reserved.

The content contained within this book may not be reproduced, duplicated or transmitted without direct written permission from the author or the publisher.

Under no circumstances will any blame or legal responsibility be held against the publisher, or author, for any damages, reparation, or monetary loss due to the information contained within this book, either directly or indirectly.

Legal Notice:

This book is copyright protected. It is only for personal use. You cannot amend, distribute, sell, use, quote or paraphrase any part, or the content within this book, without the consent of the author or publisher.

Disclaimer Notice:

Please note the information contained within this document is for educational and entertainment purposes only. All effort has been executed to present accurate, up to date, reliable, complete information. No warranties of any kind are declared or implied. Readers acknowledge that the author is not engaged in the rendering of legal, financial, medical or professional advice. The content within this book has been derived from various sources. Please consult a licensed professional before attempting any techniques outlined in this book.

By reading this document, the reader agrees that under no circumstances is the author responsible for any losses, direct or indirect, that are incurred as a result of the use of the

information contained within this document, including, but not limited to, errors, omissions, or inaccuracies.

Table of Contents

[Introduction](#)

Chapter 1: The History of Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP)

[Chapter 2: How to Use Neuro-Linguistic Programming \(NLP\)](#)

[Chapter 3: An In-Depth Look at Manipulation](#)

[Chapter 4: How to Manipulate](#)

[Chapter 5: How to Spot a Fellow Manipulator](#)

[Chapter 6: The History of Reading Body Language](#)

[Chapter 7: How to Read Body Language](#)

[Chapter 8: How to Use Your Body Language](#)

[Chapter 9: The History of Hypnosis](#)

[Chapter 10: How to Make Use of Hypnosis](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[References](#)

Introduction

The concept of 'brainwashing' dates far back in time, with the first "thought reform" taking place in Russian concentration camps in the early twentieth century, during which citizens were imprisoned with the hope of manipulating them to be better communists. Communist China was the birthplace of the term 'brainwashing' in the mid-twentieth century, after a journalist, Edward Hunter, used it to describe the manipulative techniques used by the Chinese to better control their citizens. Hunter worked in China and Japan during the mid-twentieth century, so he knew how the communist government operated and what happened behind the scenes. He believed the United States of America (USA) had lost the Cold War because they were up against countries who were employing mind control, while they themselves were against it.

The term 'brainwashing' was first used to explain why prisoners of war were so willing to work together with their captors—this idea was firmly cemented into the American collective consciousness after Robert Ford and James Carne claimed to have been victims of Chinese "mind reform" upon returning to the USA from communist China. The Chinese, however, did not believe they were performing any brainwashing; instead, they held the belief that they were simply trying to turn reactionary citizens into right-thinking citizens.

Former prisoners of the Korean War were studied by famous psychologist Robert Lifton, who was able to map out a series of steps which he had observed in subjects who had been involved in the brainwashing process. However, whether this was done domestically or whether it was done while the person was a prisoner of war was not taken into account. These steps were:

1. Assault on identity;
2. Guilt;
3. Self-betrayal;
4. Breaking point;
5. Leniency;
6. Compulsion to confess;
7. Channeling of guilt;
8. Releasing of guilt;
9. Progress and harmony; and finally,
- 10.

Final confession and re-birth.

The USA's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) spent most of the mid-twentieth century trying to figure out how they could use mind control domestically to compete with the communist nations that had been employing "mind reform" for decades. This led to projects like MK Ultra.

The USA has also, in the past, recognized mind control in criminal trials (though this defence was seldom upheld). Charles Manson, who was put on trial for the Tate-LaBianca murders in 1969, reminded American citizens of the dangers of mind control after it was claimed that he had manipulated his cult into committing the horrific murders that claimed the lives of six people, including the pregnant actress Sharon Tate.

Similarly, in 1974, a member of the iconic Hearst-family was kidnapped by a left-wing militant party. Patty Hearst was only 19-years-old at the time, and claimed that the organization had kidnapped her out of her Berkley apartment. Hearst testified that she had been held in a closet, blindfolded and bound, for weeks. She further stated that during this time she was informed that the militant group was planning to kill her, and held that she firmly believed if she didn't join their political cause, that it would lead to her untimely end. Thus, Hearst assumed the moniker

'Tania' and slowly spiraled into a crime spree with her newfound allegiance.

In 1975, Hearst was finally apprehended. She weighed only 87 pounds at the time of her arrest, and was described as a "low IQ zombie" by Dr. Margaret Singer. Psychiatrist Louis West, appointed by the court as a "mind control expert," would later plead with the president to pardon Hearst, whom he firmly believed to have been a victim of brainwashing. The judge held that mind control was not sufficiently mitigating, and sentenced Hearst to imprisonment.

Another example of mind control rearing its head in the American judicial system was the Steven Fishman case. Fishman, who belonged to the Church of Scientology, Fishman extorted approximately one million dollars from local businesses between 1983 and 1988. This lucrative criminal enterprise came to a grinding halt when he was arrested for the crimes. Fishman's attorney decided to raise a plea of insanity, arguing that his client suffered from false memory syndrome. The court ultimately rejected the attorney's expert witnesses and sentenced Fisherman to five years' imprisonment. Fishman attempted to convince the judge that the Church of Scientology had brainwashed him.

The Fishman case gave rise to a certain level of hysteria, with the public (and government) wondering about the extent to which religious institutions (or 'cults') could employ brainwashing to garner members or followers.

The USA's reluctance to accept brainwashing as a valid defense is in contrast to its own studies made on brainwashing and mind control in the 1950s (Benjamin Zablocki, 1997, p. 96).

Similarly, Italy once had a defence for brainwashing in its books. This defence was named 'plagio' and asserted that a person who "subjects another to their power" would be

liable for up to fifteen years' imprisonment. This crime was only struck from the Italian law books in 1981.

What was once deemed as pseudo-science and seldom spoken of finally rose out of the shadows of its origins. Now, mentalists like Derren Brown make a living ostensibly reading minds and seemingly controlling entire crowds of people (and their experiences). Not only is brainwashing common in popular media, but it was written into the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V), moving it into the realm of medical science.

At its core, 'brainwashing' or "mind control," describes the idea that the human mind can be controlled through psychological techniques employed by another individual. Brainwashing reduces the victim's resistance to manipulation so that new ideas can be introduced into the subconscious mind. During this process, the victim remains completely unaware of the influence being exercised over them.

Brainwashing isn't used exclusively in criminal trials and by the military, though—it's often used for far more nefarious purposes. Human traffickers often use manipulation and mind control techniques to lure in victims, and to control them once lured in. These seduction techniques are often very similar to the grooming techniques used by child sexual predators. Researcher Alexis Kennedy states that she has found manipulators often find mind control to be more effective when they implement it alongside affection and seduction. This flirtatious brainwashing can lead to the victim acting against their own value-based and moral beliefs. Someone who has been brainwashed using more violent or forceful methods is often far less cooperative.

Perspecticide is another form of mind control far removed from the military methods that often have the media in a

buzz. Perspecticide occurs when a controlling partner manages to influence (if not, entirely change) the other partner's beliefs. The controlling partner manipulates the victim by taking control of their access to financial security, transport, and employment opportunities.

Another well-known attempt at mind control was that of Jose Manuel Rodriguez Delgado, who was a professor of neurophysiology at Yale University. Delgado believed that implants or 'chips' inserted into the brain could influence the brain's electrical signals in order to elicit a desired response. Delgado is best known for his running bull experiment in which he transplanted a 'chip' into a raging bull's brain, and then, with the click of a button, activated the chip and stopped the animal mid-charge.

Brainwashing on a larger scale isn't just a topic found in history or sci-fi—it's still happening. BJ Fogg recently founded captology, an area of study that owes its name to the abbreviation 'CAPT,' which stands for "computers as persuasive technology." Fogg is responsible for many tech-features known as "hot triggers" that we have just accepted as the norm—the 'ding' from your smartphone when you receive a message or notification, the thumbs-up icon that we have all come to know and love on the world wide web, and the corresponding "like statistics." These "hot triggers" release a flood of endorphins into the brain, ensuring that the application's user keeps coming back for more, somewhat like a rat on a wheel (BJ Fogg, 2003, p. 31).

Furthermore, Robert Epstein supports the notion of a more sinister form of mind control in the tech world: the Search Engine Manipulation Effect (SEME). The SEME effect revolves around the fact that Internet users, when searching for information on a search engine, are most likely to click through to the website connected to the first or second link that appears within the search results, with 90% of all

successful searches being chosen from the top 10 search results. In this way, the human race has handed over the reins to which knowledge we access to search engine optimizers. Similarly, search engines (and the companies that control them) now have quite an influential say in what information is shared, and with how many people.

Epstein, along with associate professor Ronald Robertson, wanted to test whether this SEME could affect the outcome of elections. During this experiment, Robertson and Epstein asked Americans to research an upcoming Australian election (along with the candidates who were running) on the specially-designed 'Kadoodle' search engine. Unsurprisingly, half of the participants voted for the candidate who the search engine had been programmed to prefer. This was a terrifying example of how easily political persuasions can be swayed using propaganda.

Mind control via propaganda is also not a thing of the past. The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) inundates citizens of their protectorates with extremist propaganda, from pamphlets, to billboards, to advertisements on television. ISIS also partakes in less technologically advanced techniques of mind control, including broadcasting chanting or sermons over intercommunication systems throughout the towns and cities which they have occupied, and conducting public beheadings (Alexandra Stein, 2006, p. 88).

Whether the Cold War or targeted advertising comes to mind when you think of mind control, the fact remains that we are all surrounded by brainwashing techniques all day, every day. Why not learn to master them ourselves?

Chapter 1: The History of Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP)

The point of NLP is to aid the user in learning how their (or their subject's) mind interprets and processes words (linguistics). NLP consists of numerous working components—namely, techniques and strategies for achieving excellence and success through understanding how our thoughts and behavior influences outcomes. Richard Bandler himself defined NLP as: “... An attitude which is an insatiable curiosity about human beings with a methodology which leaves behind it a trail of techniques.” John Grinder, the co-founder of NLP, similarly defined it as: “The strategies, tools and techniques... [which] represent an opportunity unlike any other for the exploration of human functioning, or more precisely, that rare and valuable subset of human functioning known as genius” (Nlp.com, 2020).

Historically, many ideologies played a role in the formation of NLP. Cybernetics, the study of communication and automatic control systems, contributed largely to the kind of thinking that laid the path for the birth of NLP. Cybernetics is the area of study from which NLP draws its notion of a “closed signaling loop”—this relationship became apparent when John Grinder, one of the founding fathers of NLP, stated that: “the basic unit of analysis in face-to-face communication is the feedback loop.” It essentially concerns itself with the study of learning, cognition, adaptation, social control, emergence, convergence, communication, efficacy, and connectivity. The word ‘cybernetics’ has Greek etymology, with the original Greek root word meaning ‘governance.’ The word itself first appeared in Plato’s *Alcibiades* (Sciencedirect.com, 2020).

The early twentieth century saw a “self-help” wave sweep over America. This was perhaps the greatest push towards using NLP to make changes in one’s personal life, instead of just using it as a management tool within a business or to help kick a habit like smoking. The stage was set for Grinder and Bandler by books like Dale Carnegie’s *How to Win Friends and Influence People* , first published in 1936, and Norman Vincent Peale’s *The Power of Positive Thinking* , first published in 1952.

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, initially published in his paper, *A Theory of Human Motivation*, is a theory of psychological well-being built on fulfilling innate human needs in priority, culminating in self-actualization. In 1943, Maslow stated that men whose entire hierarchy of needs had been met would be as close to perfection (and capable of contemplating deeper things) as humanly possible. Maslow also believed in ‘modeling,’ a concept which will be further covered in the next chapter.

In NLP, modeling refers to when one takes on the characteristics of a more successful person in hopes of becoming more successful themselves. Maslow modeled up to sixty people whom he believed to be self-realized at the time. Modeling was not just for the average Joe, however. The founding fathers of NLP, John Grinder and Richard Bandler, modeled themselves after three psychology professionals whom they had admired: Fritz Perls and his signature work around Gestalt therapy, Virginia Satir and her Systemic Family Therapy, and Milton Erickson’s Hypnotherapy. This admiration grew and grew until it eventually bloomed into NLP itself.

Grinder and Bandler often questioned how these specialties could be used by others, as well. First, they considered the communication patterns used, then their attitudes, and

finally, the psychotherapist's unique perspective was taken into account.

Fritz Perls, a German-born psychiatrist who mainly treated patients using Gestalt therapy, focused on enhancing awareness of sensation, perception, emotion, behavior, and teaching personal responsibility. This humanistic form of psychotherapy aimed to enable the recipient to become more creative and fully alive. Gestalt therapy was at its peak during the mid-twentieth century, and still holds strong even today. It remains a popular choice of treatment for mental health patients and those in need of counseling.

On the other hand, Virginia Satir, the pioneer of Systemic Family Therapy, focused on families or 'groups' rather than on a singular individual and their problems and challenges. Systemic Family Therapy differs from more traditional forms of therapy since it doesn't examine the underlying causes to problems within a relationship. Instead, it seeks to correct how people choose to approach these problems. Satir isn't the only American psychotherapist whose therapies have been absorbed into the core tenets of NLP—it is important not to forget the contributions and writings of Milton Erickson.

Erickson's hypnotherapy aims to increase both a person's focus and their suggestibility by inducing a trance-like state. But this hypnotherapy was unique—it was language-centered, and it earned its own name: Ericksonian hypnotherapy. The complex language patterns Erickson employed during therapy were in direct contrast to the informal conversational style which he otherwise used when conversing with his patients. The divergence from swinging a pocket watch in front of a Victorian damsel's face to wordplay led many of Erickson's colleagues to shun him. Erickson must have often been told that he was a fraud, with

many remaining skeptical of his theories and ideas during his academic lifetime.

While Bandler and Grinder's contemporaries were notable, the true birth of NLP happened at the University of California in Santa Cruz, where Grinder had been studying psychology and Bandler had been lecturing on linguistics. At the time, Bandler had been carrying out an in-depth study on Satir, and noticed something strange. He realized that certain phrases and questions employed by Satir had proven effective in eliciting a desired response from her patients. By this time, both Bandler and Grinder had already met and were working together. Bandler quickly pulled Grinder into his world, asking for his help researching why Satir, and her magical language, had been so therapeutic and healing to severely disturbed patients and incredibly strained relationships alike. The result of this research can be deemed as the infancy of NLP.

NLP is not a theoretical set of concepts; rather, it is a series of 'models.' These models are perspectives that allow for predictions.

NLP also functions on a set number of presuppositions. Although numerous NLP authors have differing lists of tenements, the core values are:

- That verbal communication is, to put it bluntly, largely pointless. What is meant by this is that the words employed in conversation are often one of the least important cues to look out for. Studies have found that in emotional situations, about 90% of communication is non-verbal. NLP thus encourages one to place equal focus on the tone of voice, rhythm, pauses in speech, facial expressions, and body language.
- The only point of communication is the response it elicits. Someone who is mindful of NLP is more

concerned with how their communicative partner responds to this communication than with the communication itself. This creates somewhat of a moral gray area because, in this case, truthfulness may come second to what needs to be said in order to draw out the wanted reaction.

- People exist within their own 'map' of reality. For example, it is considered ill-mannered in America to eat with your hands in a formal setting, however, in some regions of Japan, it is considered a compliment. Despite all living in the same world, our experiences are subjective. We attach meaning to words, places, people, music, and art which to others might be entirely meaningless. Understanding someone's world map is essentially understanding them, and thus offers insight into how to communicate with them more efficiently.
- All people are influenceable through NLP. This is true simply because all people live within these maps of reality, instead of reality itself. This subjective view of the world is ever changing, which makes it manipulatable. By changing someone's map of reality, you essentially alter any future responses they may have to any stimuli. To fail is to learn. There is a famous story about a reporter who visited Thomas Edison at his homestead. This surly reporter, instead of praising Edison, asked him how it felt to have failed 10,000 times before inventing the lightbulb. Edison glibly replied that he had not failed 10,000 times, but had learned on 10,000 occasions how not to make a lightbulb. This same approach should be taken with NLP. You will not always elicit the sought-after response on your first try, but don't view this as a loss. View it as a gain, as you will have gained insight into the person's map of reality.
- The importance of choice. The person with whom you're communicating using NLP techniques needs to

feel that they have a choice, even if this is just an illusion. When faced with no way out or no way of refusing, people become aggressive and difficult to work with. By offering this person a choice, you ensure they have a say in their own destiny—they do not realize that both alternatives are outcomes which you desire.

- Breaking things into bite-sized chunks. If you're hoping to elicit a big response from someone (for example, getting them to stop smoking), it's best not to face the main challenge immediately. For instance, it would be best to start pointing out to the person how horrible smoking smells, or how yellow their fingertips have become, before suggesting that they should give up the habit entirely. During these tiny 'nudges' toward the end goal, one can observe the person's reactions to determine which way would be best to influence them.

Robert Dilts published his most well-known book, *Neurological Levels*, in 1990. This essentially changed the way that NLP was, and still is, approached. In this book, Dilts set out various neurological levels upon which a person may operate, and the various corresponding levels of motivation connected to the aforementioned neurological levels. These levels and their unique motivations are:

- Identity: What kind of person is the recipient motivated to become? What kind of person do they believe themselves to currently be?
- Spirit: Is the person motivated to do morally good things? Do they follow any specific religious path which may inhibit or motivate the way in which they act?
- Capability: What is the recipient capable of doing? Is what you're asking the recipient within the realm of possibility? If not, what incapacitates the person from doing the aforementioned?

In this case, identity is the most important neurological level, according to Dilts—the theory being that if you are capable of motivating someone through identity, nearly any suggestion should be successful (as long as it remains within the realm of possibility).

NLP believes that human beings are somewhat like computers in the sense that all behaviors are direct results of sensory information and processes. It is for this reason that familiarity with “well-formedness conditions” is important to NLP practitioners. Well-formedness conditions are established patterns of behavior, things that we do regularly. Driving home from work is thus a well-formedness condition, but so is that warm, fuzzy feeling you have inside when having a heart-to-heart with an old friend. Behavior does not have to be physically manifested. It is important to remember this. Emotional behavior is considered behavior too, in the field of psycho-therapy.

Grinder and Bandler also emphasize the idea of ecology. An NLP practitioner needs to be aware of the effect his or her actions may have, before making a change in the NLP recipient. It is important to consider how this change will affect their personal relationships, their professional relationships, their financial security, and their overall quality of life.

Grinder and Bandler believed that people, like computers, had pre-programmed “meta-programs.” They hypothesized that one needed to be familiar with someone’s meta-programs in order to access their perspective. These meta-programs represent biases within a person’s behavioral processing system, and include things such as whether or not someone prioritizes by considering the short-term or the long-term consequences, and their intrinsic and extrinsic motivations—are they motivated by moving toward positive outcomes, or by steering clear of negative outcomes,

generalities or details. It also includes their sense of introversion versus extroversion, whether they focus on similarities or differences, and what is their preferred context for information (whether this centres around people, procedures, places, actions, or emotions).

NLP originally developed in four distinctive waves known as: NLPure, NLPt, NLPeace, and NLPsych (Rogozinska, 2016).

NLPure refers to the original wave of NLP that swept over the globe after being unleashed upon us by Bandler and Grinder. To be more specific, NLPure first surfaced in 1972, after the release of Bandler and Grinder's paper titled *Success and Enthusiasm*. *Success and Enthusiasm* saw the birth of NLP. NLPure is NLP in its most basic, elementary form, as originally envisaged by Grinder and Bandler.

NLPt emerged in 1989 through another one of Dilts's novels: *Health and Joy of Living*. It is, in essence, the second wave of NLP, as developed from Grinder and Bandler's earlier theories. 1995 saw the founding of the European Association of Neuro-Linguistic Programming Training (EANLPt).

NLPeace was the next phase. It was born out of the spiritual movement of the 1990s and largely inspired by another of Dilts's novels, *Spirituality and the Meaning of Life*.

NLPsych is the fourth, and thus far final, wave of NLP. The Research and Recognition Project crafted and honed NLPsych into what it is today. The idea of NLPsych was to give NLP counselors a way to receive professional accreditation for the therapy, offered in the form of a certified degree called NPsych.

Chapter 2: How to Use Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP)

The most fundamental, basic principle of NLP is positive language. No, I'm not suggesting that by keeping a stiff upper lip, that you might be able to ignore all of your problems—rather, this approach is based in science. You see, the brain is incapable of processing negative language. This means that if you were to tell your communicative partner, "Please do not touch me," what their subconscious mind would be hearing is: "Please do touch me."

According to NLP, your subconscious mind regulates everything from digestion to breathing. This suggests that you are able to communicate with your own subconscious using this technique, as well. The idea is that if you were to repeat, "Do not get well," to yourself as a mantra, your subconscious would only hear, "Do get well," and would respond to this. Of course, negative language is best used in this way on others, and not yourself, because it's entirely possible to just repeat positive mantras to yourself. Many people are unaware of the fact that the subconscious mind is incapable of hearing negative speech (such as 'no' or 'can't'), which makes it even easier to covertly implant ideas into your their subconscious minds without them even being aware that you are the one willing them to act in a certain way.

The only time during which you have to be cognizant of your own internal dialogue when considering the effect of negative language on the subconscious mind is when your self-talk begins using negatives without your awareness. For example, if you accidentally think, "I hope I don't get nervous during this interview," your subconscious mind will

hear, “I hope I do get nervous during this interview.” For this reason, it is incredibly important to be mindful of the tone of your own internal dialogue, and phrase thoughts positively like, “I hope I am calm during the interview,” to bypass negative speech’s impact on your brain.

The second most fundamental tenement of using NLP is targeted talk. NLP theorizes that all people communicate in one of three ways: auditory, visual, or kinesthetic. Furthermore, NLP demands of its user to be aware of these communicative styles, and to try to pinpoint which best suits their communicative partner. When your words fit your unique communicative style, it is much easier to deliver new ideas into someone’s mind.

The best way to find out someone’s communicative style is through listening to them speak. Someone whose style can be described as auditory might use phrases such as: “That sounds great,” or “I hear you’re busy working on a project.” Those who are more prone to kinesthetic communication might say something like: “This homework is hard,” or “I feel like you are not listening to me,” or even, “I’m going through a rough time.” Those who are visual communicators, on the other hand, use phrases like: “I see you went to the shops again this morning,” or “Look on the bright side.”

Once you determine the style which best fits your communicative partner, you can start using this to your advantage. Visual people are more likely to be complacent if you communicate with them using gestures and smiles. Another great suggestion is to employ vivid, descriptive language to visually express any physical places or things. It is a good idea to do this if you would like to draw your communicative partner in and keep them focused on you.

Auditory people listen to a speaker’s tone and intonation. It is thus very important to control the pitch and sound of your

voice, using inflections and variances in both to keep your communicative partner engaged.

Kinesthetic learners are 'feelers' and not 'thinkers.' If you can tap into this by using emotive language, instead of just delivering the facts, you're far more likely to be successful in your communications with them. Furthermore, telling them, "I have a gut feeling about this," might make them more prone to believing you, as this is the level that they operate on.

Of course, learning what your communicative partner's communicative style is can take some time, as you would essentially need to build a rapport with them first. Luckily, there is a way to bypass this which is nearly as effective as observing someone's patterns of speech. The trick is to watch their eyes.

Kinesthetic thinkers tend to look down while they are communicating, whilst auditory thinkers look down and visual thinkers look laterally left or right. Watching someone's eye movements might reveal an incredible amount about how they choose to communicate, and how best to communicate with them.

The next NLP technique, which is easy to use and very effective, is known as mirroring. The mirroring technique is based on the idea that we are more prone to trusting people who share similarities with us, such as mannerisms and speech patterns. This means that through careful observation, one might be able to imbibe a few of another person's characteristics. This will eventually help them trust you and share similar perspectives.

The trick with mirroring is to not make it too obvious. If you simply copy your communicative partner's behavior, they'll soon become suspicious and wonder what you are up to. The best way to covertly mirror someone is by matching their

speech patterns. If someone is very prone to using slang in their speech, it might be a good idea, for example, to throw some slang words into your own communications with them.

Speech isn't the only thing that can be mirrored, though. Gestures are a good place to start. For example, if your communicative partner is sitting with their legs crossed, you may want to do the same. Here, too, you will need to employ a measure of stealth and not mimic every gesture they make.

Disassociation is another NLP technique that is often used by practitioners. Disassociation cannot usually be used on a communicative partner; instead, its purpose is to help the user overcome negative emotions. These are the steps to follow to employ disassociation:

1. Identify how you are feeling. Are you feeling sad? Angry? Frustrated? Perhaps scared?
2. Once you have identified the feeling that you are experiencing, imagine yourself floating out of your body, exiting from the top of your head. Imagine yourself looking down at your body, and seeing its surroundings and how it is reacting to the negative emotion that you wish to eliminate.
3. Finally, imagine the feeling within yourself changing. Perhaps you feel your chest tightening from nervousness—now imagine feeling that knot in your chest slowly unravel and become loose and comfortable.

Anchoring is the next technique, and this one can be used on communicative partners. Anchoring originated from Ivan Pavlov's theory of classical conditioning. Pavlov conducted an experiment in which he would ring a bell whenever his dogs were eating. After a period of time, Pavlov was able to get the dogs to salivate just by ringing the bell, even when

there was no food present. Anchoring works in much the same way.

When using anchoring on a communicative partner, start off by conditioning them with a certain gesture or phrase. Whenever they're experiencing the emotion you would like to elicit in the future, employ this gesture or phrase to connect these two experiences in your communicative partner's mind. If you have been successful in creating an 'anchor,' you should be able to elicit this emotion within your communicative partner simply by using the phrase or gesture in front of them, without any outside stimuli or manipulation.

Another very useful technique is called the "concealed commands" method. A concealed command is a manner of phrasing a question in such a way that your communicative partner does not realize that you are directing him or her toward a set outcome. An example of a concealed command is, "Which movie would you like to watch?" instead of asking, "Would you like to watch a movie?"

The "if you want" technique is somewhat similar to the "concealed commands" method in that they both rely heavily on word play. The purpose of the "if you want" technique is to get your communicative partner to do something which you do not want to do. An example of this is asking your communicative partner, "I can pay the bill if you want"—your communicative partner will feel that since you've offered to pay the bill, etiquette demands they now make the same offer. Which, of course, you will accept. In this way, you're actually shifting the responsibility for the problem onto your communicative partner and away from yourself.

However, word play in NLP doesn't just end and begin with concealed commands and the "if you want" technique. NLP also emphasizes the importance of the word 'but.' 'But' is a

special word, because the human mind generally only hears and focuses on the part of the sentence after the 'but.' For example, if I said, "Susan is a pretty girl but she has horrible teeth," all that my communicative partner would hear is that Susan has horrible teeth. If I reworded the question as, "Susan has horrible teeth but she is a pretty girl," all that my communicative partner's mind would absorb is that Susan is a pretty girl.

The opposite is true for the word 'and.' The human mind only hears whatever part of the sentence came before 'and.' This means that if I were to say, "We are going swimming and then we will have lunch," the only thing our mind would focus on is that we are going swimming. However, if I rephrased the sentence to say, "We are going to have lunch, and before that we will go swimming," all the mind would hear is that we are going to have lunch.

Words aren't the only things that hold power in NLP, though. Touch is also important. When you're building a rapport (establishing trust) with a new communicative partner, a few well-placed touches on the upper arm during conversation can lead them into feeling a sense of trust toward you sooner rather than later.

The final NLP technique to be aware of is pacing. Essentially, pacing requires that you give, for example, three definite facts to your communicative partner, followed by the concept which you want your communicative partner to accept as the truth. An example of a pacing script is the following: "Our boss is on leave today (first true fact), and she took the secretaries with her (second true fact). The chief executive officer is here, though (third true fact). Our boss is always on leave (untrue fact)." Because you've prefaced the untrue fact (that your boss is always on leave) by first giving two or three definite facts, your

communicative partner is more likely to accept the untrue fact as absolute truth.

Chapter 3: An In-Depth Look at Manipulation

When we speak about manipulation that doesn't involve force or controlling someone's finances, we are talking about psychological manipulation. Psychological manipulation is a type of social influence which, through deceptive or covert ways, influences a person's perception of the world or their behavior.

Manipulation can further be broken down into two subsets: positive manipulation and negative manipulation. Positive manipulation occurs when someone is being manipulated for their own good. An example of this would be a doctor trying to convince his patient to stop smoking. Negative manipulation is the opposite—it involves manipulating another person for ulterior motives or personal gain. An example of negative manipulation would be a salesman convincing a customer to buy a product which he knows is defective or will not be suitable for the buyer.

George Simon posits that manipulation essentially consists of two factors—the first factor being the ability to conceal aggression or negative intentions, and the second being the ability to read people. Manipulators need to be able to extrapolate the weaknesses of the person they are trying to manipulate in order to exploit them, and thus they need to be incredibly skilled in analyzing people and their motivations.

In 1996, Simon authored a self-help book titled *In Sheep's Clothing: Understanding and Dealing with Manipulative People*. In this book, he posited that successful manipulators usually:

- Know their victim's psychological vulnerabilities. For example, a mother will absolutely go out of her way if she thinks what she is doing will be to the benefit of her child. Similarly, if someone has a phobia of large crowds, this can be used to manipulate them into not going to a party (for example) by telling them that you expect many people to be there.
- Are ruthless. Manipulators need to be ruthless to avoid having moral qualms about influencing people in the way they do. Being unconcerned with the welfare of the person you're manipulating is par for the course.
- Have the ability to conceal their emotions and use it to their advantage. This makes sense, when you think about it. Breaking into tears during a formal debate in high school would be a terrible idea and would influence absolutely nobody; however, breaking into tears while asking someone for a loan would definitely work to your advantage, as you would be forcing the person to empathize with you.

Simon went even further, eventually studying the techniques that manipulators use to influence people. These methods range from lying, to feigning confusion and innocence, to playing the victim, and, of course, seduction.

Simon isn't the only psychologist who has studied manipulators and their ways. Harriet Braiker was a clinical psychologist who rose to fame in the year 2000 with her book, *The Disease to Please*, in which she discussed how easily influenced people-pleasers are. In her 2004 novel, *Who is Pulling the Strings*, she further elaborated on the concept of manipulation—but this time, the focus was on the manipulators themselves. Braiker identified four distinctive ways in which manipulators influence people:

1. Punishment. This doesn't mean punishment like a parent would punish a child by, for example,

grounding them. Manipulators use social punishment to ensure they can exert their influence over others. The most common form of social punishment is the silent treatment, whereby they exclude the person from events or driving a wedge between the person and their friends or family.

2. Positive reinforcement. To put it simply, this is flattery. Manipulators may try to get their way by showering the person they wish to influence with compliments, or by doing nice things for them (like bringing them coffee to work). Positive reinforcement may be as seemingly insignificant as a smile or a pat on the back, or as grandiose as drawing public attention to the person the manipulator wishes to influence.
3. Negative reinforcement. Negative reinforcement, despite its misleading name, does not involve punishment. Instead, it's a different type of reward. A manipulator who is using negative reinforcement might say, "You don't have to come to the meeting tomorrow if you drive me to the mall today." In this way, the manipulator frees the person they wish to influence from doing something which they do not wish to do by, essentially, forcing them to accept the manipulator's alternative.
4. Traumatic one-time learning. This involves the manipulator making such an impact on the person he or she wishes to manipulate that no further reinforcement or punishment is necessary. An example of this would be an outburst of anger so immense that the person on the receiving end does not even consider disobeying.

All of the above methods in which manipulators influence people require one common trait: remorselessness. And the least remorseful of them all? The psychopath. Psychopathy

is a mental disorder characterised by a lack of remorse or empathy, extreme manipulativeness, antisocial behavior, and egotism. Psychopaths are master manipulators, and thus, despite their less than stellar reputation, they are fantastic role models to mirror in order to master the art of manipulation. Robert Hare and Paul Babiak theorized that psychopaths operate by manipulating people through a three-phase approach.

The first phase is known as the *assessment phase* . During this phase, the psychopath chooses the person they plan to manipulate. They keep an eye out for traits like status, wealth, and influence—seldomly going after someone who has nothing to offer them.

The second phase is the *manipulation phase* , during which the psychopath carefully crafts the persona which the person they want to manipulate will come to know. Once this 'mask' has been created, the psychopath can begin eliciting anything they want from the now very willing, trusting victim.

The third and final phase is called the *abandonment phase* . After the psychopath has gained all they wanted to gain from the person they've manipulated, they simply drop the mask and exit the victim's life. As soon as the person is no longer gainful to the psychopath, the psychopath will see no reason to maintain a relationship with them.

Chapter 4: How to Manipulate

Manipulation is, in essence, the art of deception. And, as it is an art, it is teachable—and something which you can learn to master.

There are almost an infinite number of psychological manipulation techniques; however, only the most successfully employed techniques will be discussed in this chapter.

The first psychological manipulation technique we'll examine is known as the **fear-then-relief** method. In his 2007 novel, *The Science of Social Influence*, Anthony Pratkanis explains that this technique involves eliciting an extreme fear response from your subject, and then quickly and abruptly relieving this fear. The minute the subject exits the shroud of fear that the manipulator has imbued them with, they are disarmed. This moment of pliability happens when the subject's mind tries to process whatever just happened. Pratkanis's book also cites a study which supports this method's efficacy. During this experiment, shoppers were tapped on the shoulder while perusing the store's shelves by a strange blind man. The tap on the shoulder made them jump, but realizing that it had only been a blind man wanting to ask the time immediately relieved their fear. After this encounter, the scientists conducting the study tried to sell the shoppers a political postcard. The shoppers who had experienced the encounter with the blind man were more likely to buy the postcard than the control group of shoppers, who were less interested in the purchase.

This technique is easy to apply in real-life scenarios. For example, you could tell a coworker, "Our boss noticed you left early on Thursday... but don't worry, I covered for you."

The theory is that directly after using a sentence similar to this, your communicative partner should be more receptive to commands.

The next technique is called the **social exchange**, and is basically a well-thought-out guilt trip. Richard Perloff first described this as a manipulation technique in his book, *The Dynamics of Persuasion*. A social exchange is like an unwritten social contract. Most cultures prime us to accept “tit for tat,” and thus, once someone has done us a favor, we feel indebted to them. You can use this to your advantage.

A real-life example of this would be reminding a coworker of a favor you did for them (“Remember when I covered for you last Thursday?”) before asking for something in return. He suggests that after being reminded of the favor you did him or her, your coworker is more likely to be compliant with a request.

The **foot-in-the-door** technique was first described by Johnathan Freedman and Scott Fraser in their 1996 study, *Compliance Without Pressure: The Foot in the Door Technique*. This technique essentially entails asking a small favor of someone, and after this favor has been granted, asking a second, larger favor. Freedman and Scott believed that after agreeing to comply with the first request, a person would be more likely to agree to the second. An example of this, which you may have personally experienced already, would be when a homeless person asks you for directions, and upon receiving them from you, asks for \$10. Theoretically, you are more likely to offer the \$10 if you had agreed to give the directions first. You could apply this technique at work, for example, by asking your coworker to check your emails for you. Once they have complied, you could then, in theory, ask them to reply to a customer query in your inbox, and they would be more likely to agree.

Another infamous manipulation technique is **blame shifting** , also known as **projection** . This is one of the seedier manipulation techniques available to manipulators, but it is very effective. Human beings are programmed to want to assign blame to someone, or something, for nearly any unfortunate circumstance that could befall us—and we are particularly receptive to being told who is to blame, instead of ascertaining it for ourselves. This is also responsible for the phenomenon known as a “witch hunt.”

You can use this propensity to assign blame to your own advantage. When stuck in a situation in which you are “in trouble” (whether this is with a romantic partner, a friend or your boss), it is best to choose a new suspect to blame for whatever misfortune you may have caused and single them out to the person confronting you. Human nature will push them to accept whomever you have assigned blame to as the guilty party. You could even shift the blame onto the person who is confronting you without this technique losing its efficacy.

But blame shifting is not the only technique available to master manipulators. Its cousin, **gaslighting** , is pretty effective, too. Gaslighting is a psychological manipulation technique in which the manipulator, in essence, drives the recipient to doubt his or her own sanity, perception of reality, or memory. Gaslighting is a long-term manipulation technique, so it generally requires a bit of commitment.

The first step of gaslighting is to isolate the victim from friends and family—you essentially need to be their only contact with the world. This can be done by causing them to doubt their friends’ intentions and motives, or by causing a rift in their relationships through some other means. Once you have someone isolated, you basically control how they see and interact with the world.

The second step is to gain the victim's trust by opening up to them. Tell them your deepest, darkest secrets—they don't necessarily have to be true—and the victim will almost immediately feel a sense of trust in you. This doesn't mean you should run up to strangers and confess that you killed the family cat—the secret to this is timing. Open up to the victim when it is appropriate. This means that you will need to foster at least some kind of reciprocal relationship with the person you intend to manipulate.

The third step is to be nice—at least, at first. The trick is to be kind to the victim until they begin to crave your affection. It is at this point that you can either maintain the relationship or, if your motives are darker, slowly withdraw your affection. The recipient is more likely to be loyal toward the manipulator if they feel affection toward them, and will theoretically be even more complacent should the manipulator slowly start to deprive them of this affection.

The fourth step is projection, as described earlier in this chapter. It is important that you do not allow the victim to see any fault in you. A good manipulator needs to be squeaky clean and blameless. When hiccups do arise in your relationship with the recipient, it is important that you assign the blame to someone other than yourself. Once again, the blame can even be shifted onto the recipient themselves, in this scenario.

The final step is to warp the victim's sense of reality or self. Manipulators do this by telling their recipients that they are simply imagining things, that they are overreacting, or that their emotional response is not appropriate even when it is. If the above four steps have been completed successfully, the manipulator should be able to cause the recipient to believe that they are going crazy or that their perceptions of the world are invalid altogether.

Chapter 5: How to Spot a Fellow Manipulator

While manipulating others might be gainful to you, being manipulated by someone else is definitely not. It is for this reason that it is just as important to know how to spot a manipulator as it is to know how to manipulate.

Some people are simply born manipulators blessed with the gift of the gab, and these natural-born manipulators all seem to share some common traits as described by psychiatrist, Abigail Brenner.

- They are incapable of true altruism. Manipulative people hardly, if ever, do something out of the goodness of their hearts—there is usually an ulterior motive. For example, a manipulative person might buy you lunch today, and while you'd think that they were simply being generous, the aforementioned manipulative person would actually be planning to ask you to work one of their shifts tomorrow.
- They're big talkers, but that is where it ends. Manipulators do not usually follow up their grandiose speeches or ideas with actual action. They build these incredible castles in the sky to draw you in, without the intention of ever acting on any of the commitments or promises they might make. For example, your boss may continually hint at a promotion before every big project they assign to you, but has no intention to actually promote you—they're simply trying to manipulate you into giving 110% to a project in the hope of furthering your career.
- They are not empathetic. Manipulators either choose not to empathize with others or are simply incapable of

empathy. You might spot a manipulator in this way, for example, when your company is undergoing downsizing. Under normal circumstances, even the employees who are not being laid off will feel sad and sorry for their colleagues who are losing their jobs, but a manipulator may be smug, or perhaps entirely apathetic, about their colleagues' misfortune.

- They are better gossips than your average high school girl. Manipulators enjoy watching people squirm—and what better way to do this than by spreading malicious stories or by sharing the blunders of others with the world? Your colleague standing at the watercooler telling everyone about Sarah's divorce, and reveling in the gory details, might be revealing themselves to be a manipulator.
- They will misuse even the smallest kindness you might show them. If you give manipulators an inch, they take a mile. Manipulators take advantage of people, it is simply what they do—and there's no easier way for them to do this than if you have already opened the door to their abuse by doing them a favor or by being kind to them. An example of this might be if you brought your coworker coffee for the morning meeting one day, and suddenly, this is what is expected of you—and now this coworker gets upset when they arrive at the meeting and their cup of coffee is not already waiting for them. This coworker might be a manipulator.
- They like to play the blame game. Manipulators don't want to accept responsibility for their own wrongdoings, so they attempt to assign the blame to someone else—even if it means ruining that person's career, relationships, or friendships. An example of this might be that one coworker who made a blunder on a project they had been working on, but when confronted blamed the team leader for their failure or incompetence—resulting in their team leader losing their job. A

manipulator would happily sacrifice somebody else's career in this way.

- They do not have boundaries. At all. Manipulators usually do not understand, or do not care about, the social contract prescribing the rules of etiquette to which the rest of us subscribe. A manipulator might ask you questions that are just a little too personal, or might call you about a work-related matter at an unreasonable hour, or might show up at your house unexpectedly. They don't understand, or don't care about, the concept of being "rude."
- They are unwilling to compromise. It's their way or the highway. Manipulators insist on things being done exactly as they expect them to be done. Whether this is due to a need to insist on having authority or whether this is an inborn defect is unknown. And when they do not get their way, the resulting outburst is often incredibly aggressive and explosive. For this reason, people are often wary of going against a manipulator, which is why so many of them allegedly end up in higher management positions.

Of course, the other "natural-born" manipulator that is important to be able to spot is the psychopath. According to Amy Morin, psychotherapist and author of *13 Things Mentally Strong People Do Not Do*, psychopaths share five common traits.

1. They think that they are important. Very important. Psychopaths tend to have a grandiose sense of self, and often think of themselves as the center of the universe. As a result of this inflated ego, psychopaths often demand special, or superior, treatment. They expect to be treated as the royalty they believe themselves to be—and all hell breaks

loose when their incredibly high standards are not met.

2. They are incapable of feeling guilt or remorse. Psychopaths do not have a conscience. They are able to contemplate things which would make others rile back in disgust, gagging at the very thought. Psychopaths are often born with an underdeveloped or maldeveloped frontal lobe, impacting their ability to feel empathy or understand what is morally right or morally wrong. As a result of this, they are often capable of acts of incredible cruelty.
3. They are master manipulators. Here, you can refer back to the common traits of manipulators listed above. Psychopaths are fantastically talented at guilt-tripping others, and equally gifted at flattery and seduction. You might find yourself unknowingly, or unwittingly, obeying a psychopath's every command due to their ability to manipulate.
4. They are incredibly charming. This slots into the flattery and seduction mentioned above. Psychopaths are very good at getting people to be "on their team." They smile and joke their way into the lives of the people around you, and these people are often unable to see the psychopath for what they truly are. A psychopath will have the entire neighbourhood wrapped around their finger in no time. They might even get elected for office.
5. They are also incredibly ruthless. You will absolutely know if you have crossed a psychopath in some way as they are likely to reciprocate through small (or large) acts of revenge. They are also more than happy to turn those who are nearest and dearest to you against you, if they feel that you have wronged them in some way. A psychopath usually dispenses

his or her own justice, usually with disastrous effects.

But how can you pick a psychopath out of the crowd? Prakash Masand, founder of the Centers of Psychiatric Excellence, believes there are eight signs that suggest someone is a psychopath.

- They are irresponsible and have no regard for the safety of others. A prime example of this is the Wall Street bankers who toppled the United States into an economic crisis in 2008 due to underhanded hedge fund trading with derivatives. Many of them were aware that they would be driving others to bankruptcy, but still went ahead and did it for their own personal gain.
- They violate the rights of others. An example of this would be the case of Robert Maxwell, the incredibly wealthy publishing giant, who, after his death, was found to have stolen millions by defrauding the pension funds of thousands of innocent people.
- They engage in socially irresponsible behavior like binge drinking, addiction to narcotics, promiscuous sexual activity, or other criminal activities. An example of a psychopath engaging in socially irresponsible (or rather, reprehensible) behavior is Ted Bundy, the infamous serial killer and promising law student who confessed to murdering 30 women in his spare time.
- They are frequently in trouble with the law. This happens as a natural consequence of socially irresponsible behavior and violating the rights of others. Psychopaths are not always caught red-handed for murder, though—sometimes, these transgressions are as small as not believing that the speed limit applies to them, thus amassing a small mountain of fines.
- They like to hurt others and are often sadists. An example of this is Ilse Koch, the wife of a Nazi secret service member, who would walk around naked in a

Jewish concentration camp and had any man who so much as dared to glance at her shot on the spot.

- An inability to, or apathy toward, understanding right from wrong. Psychopaths either do not care about doing the right thing, or do not know that they are doing the wrong thing. An example of this is the “angel of mercy” stereotype found within the study of criminology. Offenders who fall under this stereotype commit murders with the belief that they are doing the victim a favor by euthanizing them.
- The tendency to lie. Often. Very often. Because psychopaths have no moral compass, they have no reason to be truthful if the truth is not gainful to them in one way or another. They have no problem with making up stories about themselves, either, whether they do it for sympathy or adoration.

Interestingly, Masand also found that men were more prone to psychopathy than women. Furthermore, psychopaths are more inclined to taking up certain professions. Kevin Dutton, the author of *The Wisdom of Psychopaths: What Saints, Spies, and Serial Killers Can Teach Us About Success*, formulated a list of ten professions which psychopaths are the most likely to pursue. According to Dutton’s research, the highest ratio of psychopaths can be found among government officials/civil servants/politicians, chefs, clergymen (or clergywomen), police officers or military personnel, journalists, surgeons, salespeople, media personalities, lawyers, and chief executive officers (CEOs).

Scientists have actually formulated a physical test by means of which psychopaths can be identified. Studies have found that psychopaths’ pupils do not dilate when they are shown gruesome or distressing images, while the average person’s do. Thus, if you suspect someone of being a psychopath, you could theoretically show them a photo of a horrific accident

scene, for example, and watch to see whether their pupils dilate.

On the other hand, it is also important to learn to spot people who will be easy to manipulate. According to Kim Saeed, the writer of *10 Essential Survivor Secrets to Liberate Yourself from Narcissistic Abuse*, there are seven personality traits which those who are easy to manipulate all have in common.

1. The need to fix and heal those around them. Those who are easy to manipulate are always on the lookout for someone down on their luck to help out of the gutter. The reason this makes them easy to manipulate is that absolutely anybody can pretend to be going through a hard time, and in doing so win the loyalty and trust of the aforementioned person.
2. An inability to set boundaries or to say “no.” Those who are easy to manipulate are generally so scared of confrontation that they are not willing to spark an argument by being resistant or by voicing their opinion. This specific trait is easy to exploit for obvious reasons—if they just can not say no, you can burden them with favors and expectations, and anticipate no resistance in return.
3. Honesty and compassion. Being honest makes you particularly manipulatable because your greatest weaknesses and loftiest aspirations are all absolutely apparent to those around you. Compassion, on the other hand, is the driving force for the first point of this list. Being overly compassionate opens you up to manipulation by those who are willing to play the victim, as master manipulators always are.

4. Stubbornness. Those who are easy to manipulate generally refuse to give up on their mission to save the very person who is manipulating them. This stubbornness leads them to tolerate behavior which they would not have tolerated under normal circumstances, thus making them easy targets for manipulation.
5. Unconditional love. Those who are the absolute easiest to manipulate are those who unconditionally love the manipulator (parents, siblings, romantic partners, friends, etc.). The reason for this is that, regardless of the kind of treatment that they are forced to endure, they continue to love the manipulator. This love is an exploitable weakness.
6. Being trusting. People who are easy to manipulate believe anything you tell them, this is also known as “being too trusting.” Some people are simply naïve, while others perhaps only see the best in the manipulator and refuse to acknowledge the uglier side—regardless of the reason, some people are easier to deceive than others.
7. Being too polite or respectful. Manipulators actively seek out those who will not call them out in public, and who better to target than those who are too coy to say something when they are made to feel uncomfortable? Being overly polite also makes one more likely to agree to small favors which, as discussed earlier, makes one more likely to agree to larger and larger favors as time passes.

Similarly, it is just as important to know some tactics to avoid being manipulated yourself. The author of *Are You Too Nice? How to Gain Appreciation and Respect*, Ni Preston, developed eight techniques to avoid being manipulated.

The first technique he described is by far the easiest to abide by. It simply involves practicing the art of saying “no.”

If you feel uncomfortable with what is being asked of you, firmly say no. You do not necessarily need to be confrontational in doing this—a simple, “Sorry, I do not have time,” will likely suffice.

The second technique is to set consequences. You need to handle a manipulator a little bit like you might handle a child: he or she needs to know the rules, and when he or she breaks these rules, there needs to be a “punishment.” An example of how you could use this is by telling a person, “I am uncomfortable talking with you about that. If you continue to talk about it, I will report you to human resources.” Manipulators do not want to get in trouble, so when trying to avoid being manipulated, make sure that you follow through on the rules and corresponding consequences which you have set.

The third technique is remembering that your time is your own, and you are allowed to take it. Manipulators will usually demand an answer to their requests immediately, in the hope of pressuring you into complying. You can circumnavigate this manipulative technique simply by saying, “I’ll think about it.” You don’t have to follow a manipulator’s timeline, and you are certainly not obligated to answer anything straight away.

The fourth technique involves asking manipulators probing questions when they make requests of you. Next time a manipulator asks you to do something for them, consider responding with, “Are you asking me, or telling me?” or “What do I get out of this?” or “Are you really expecting me to do that?” Chances are, you will catch the manipulator off-guard and perhaps even get them to withdraw the request completely (at the very least, it will force them to pause for a second and consider whether what they are doing is right).

The fifth technique is to avoid letting the manipulator make you feel guilty. You are not obligated to do anyone any

favours, and thus you have nothing to feel guilty about. Manipulators make their targets feel guilty in the hope that they will eventually feel so bad about themselves that they will give in to the manipulator's will.

The sixth technique is to keep your distance. If you know that somebody is manipulating you (or trying to), do not give them any opportunities to do so by spending time with them. It is honestly good advice just to give a manipulator a wide berth and to avoid getting pulled into their games altogether.

The seventh technique is to know your rights. Manipulators will go out of their way to violate them. Remind yourself regularly that you have the right to be treated with respect, to set your own priorities, to have a differing opinion, and to express your feelings.

The eighth, and final, technique is to confront the manipulator. Publicly. A manipulator will generally avoid the public eye, and by calling them out, you are likely to put them off trying to manipulate you ever again.

Chapter 6: The History of Reading

Body Language

Body language encompasses the gestures and motions we can interpret in order to make sense of someone else's emotions or feelings. These cues consist of posture, gestures, facial expressions, use of space and touch. Both human beings and animals make use of body language as a means of communication, though early human beings definitely relied more heavily on this form of communication than modern man.

Nobody is absolutely sure whether we are born with the ability to read body language or whether we acquire the ability as we grow up, however, most people are capable—at least at some level—of reading and interpreting body language. The reason why nobody is really sure how we acquire this ability is two-fold. Firstly, body language can be divided into numerous categories. Some of our body language is inborn, like scowling when you are angry, while other pieces are cultural and learned through observation (for example, in some African cultures it is considered rude to look an authority figure in the eye, while in the Western world, avoiding eye contact is generally considered to be a sign that a person is being deceitful). Secondly, scientists are still trying to figure out why some aspects of body language evolved and for what reason.

The study of body language, known as kinesics, probably started with Francis Bacon, an English philosopher who lived between 1561 and 1626. In 1605, in his novel *Of the Proficiency of Advancement and Learning, Human and Divine*, Bacon posited that a great deal of the

communication that occurs between human beings is done through gestures.

After Bacon, however, the study of body language went dormant for many years.

That is, until Charles Darwin came along. Darwin lived between 1809 and 1882, and was most well-known for his theories on evolution. But Darwin dabbled in psychology, too. Many, many years after Darwin's death, a professor named Peter Snyder came across an archive of an experiment Darwin had conducted on facial expressions. This experiment was inspired after Darwin and French physician, Guilleme-Benjamin-Amand Duchenne, had spent some time exchanging letters. Duchenne believed that that 60 distinct expressions could be produced by the human face, and that there were specific muscle groups which controlled each expression. Darwin disagreed. Darwin thought that there were far fewer expressions, and that many different muscles work together to control each expression.

To test his hypothesis, Darwin showed pictures of human facial expressions to 11 test subjects and asked them to identify the underlying emotion. Not surprisingly, his notes seemed to indicate that most of the respondents were able to positively identify emotions like anger, happiness, fear, shock, and excitement based off of the pictures Darwin had displayed.

The next prominent scientist to consider body language was Margaret Mead, in 1977. Mead lived between 1901 and 1978, and served as the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science during her lifetime. She believed that body language was culture specific (and thus that it did not have an inborn component).

Mead's contemporary, Paul Ekman, was born in 1934. In the mid-1960s, Ekman launched a study into whether body language was universal or culture-specific. With over 40 years of research, Ekman's prevailing consensus remains that certain facial expressions are universal, and thus are inborn. Ekman's studies with Wallace Friesen support this hypothesis, amongst others.

Desmond Morris, the famous zoologist and author of *The Naked Ape*, was born in 1928 in Wiltshire, England. He believed that body language primarily evolved to meet the challenges of prehistoric life as a hunter. One of Morris' theories, for example, is that the reason human beings are prone to monogamy is because during prehistoric life, it was important for the male hunters to be able to leave to go off on a hunt trusting that their mate would not get impregnated with another man's child while he was gone.

In 1971, Albert Mehrabian, a professor of psychology, theorized in his book *Silent Messages* that communication can be broken down into a three-part ratio. Mehrabian held that communication consisted of: seven percent words, 38% tone of voice, and 55% body language. This theory was based on two of his studies, namely *Decoding of Inconsistent Communication* and *Inference of Attitudes from Non-Verbal Communication in Two Channels*.

Despite the above scientists papering their theories on body language in the seventeenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, body language itself actually began to develop four and a half million years ago, back when Australopithecines roamed the African plains. The African continent's climate had begun to change. Where the land had previously been green and fertile, the plains were suddenly barren and tainted yellow with the windswept dried-up dust. Australopithecines was faced with the ever-growing challenge of finding food, and so, they began

working in teams. Of course, teamwork requires a certain degree of communication. This newly required non-verbal communication put an incredible strain on Australopithecines' brains—a strain that led their brains to grow from approximately 500cc to approximately 800cc two and a half million years ago. Despite this incredible increase in their brain size, Australopithecines still spent about a fifth of their time grooming each other's fur in order to bond.

About a million years ago, the first Homo erectus appeared, and the forefathers of humankind as we know it today started emigrating out of Africa.

Then, 200,000 years ago, Homo sapiens evolved. They were an improvement even on the very-social Australopithecines and had a brain volume of about 1400cc. Language was developed 50,000 years ago, and everything changed after that. Human beings no longer needed to spend 20% of their time grooming each other to bond, and gossiping quickly took its place.

All human beings alive today are the descendants of the small group of Homo sapiens who lived 50,000 years ago—and thus, it is not really surprising that we all share some universal expressions as part of our body language.

Chapter 7: How to Read Body Language

We are all capable of reading basic body language and facial expressions. We know that if someone is smiling, they are likely experiencing happiness or joy. If someone is scowling and furrowing their brow, they are probably feeling angry. There are, however, ways in which one can learn to more effectively read both, enabling you to spot even the most well-concealed of emotions.

Facial expressions seem to largely be universal, with babies learning to smile as early as six weeks after birth. Micro-expressions aren't as easy to read, though. In his 2002 book, Ekman held that a micro-expression is a quick, involuntary facial expression someone might have, giving us a brief glimpse into how they are truly feeling. Micro-expressions happen quickly (they only last for about one twenty-fifth of a second) and thus can be difficult to spot. They are impossible to fake, though, making them an incredibly effective tool for reading people.

Paul Ekman, who was ranked one of the top 100 most influential people by *Time* magazine, proved that facial expressions are so universal that people living in rural Africa or in the Amazon rainforest showed the same facial expressions for basic feelings as someone who was born and raised in the United States or Europe. Ekman also found that even those individuals who had been born blind made the same facial expressions when experiencing core human emotions as someone who was born with their sight fully intact, and who have had a lifetime of exposure to television and movies upon which to model themselves.

There are seven distinctive micro-expressions: fear, happiness, disgust, anger, sadness, contempt, and surprise. Of all of these unique micro-expressions, contempt is the easiest to spot. If someone absolutely hates what you are saying or doing, you might see them, just for a fraction of a second, raising one side of their mouth in a kind of half-smile.

Sadness is the most difficult micro-expression to fake. The characteristics of this micro-expression include the distension of the lower lip into a “pout,” drawing the innermost curve of the eyebrows inward and upward, and drawing the jaw upward or clenching it while drawing the corner of their lips downward.

Happiness, however, is the easiest micro-expression to fake. During this micro-expression, the subject smiles briefly. It is easy to spot “fake” happiness, though. If someone is faking this micro-expression, you will notice that they do not have crow’s feet at the corners of their eyes, they will not have a line running from each side of their nose to the corresponding corner of their lips, and their cheeks will be raised or “puffy.”

The fourth micro-expression is anger. When someone displays this micro-expression, their jaw will protrude outward and will be clenched, their eyebrows will be furrowed and drawn together, they will flare their nostrils, their lips will be pressed together tightly or drawn into a square-shaped pucker, and their eyes will bulge.

The micro-expression made when someone experiences disgust makes it look as if they have smelled something bad. Someone who is experiencing disgust will briefly lift their upper lip to expose their teeth, scrunch up their noses, and lift their cheeks.

Fear is the sixth micro-expression. You can spot fear by looking out for someone whose eyebrows are drawn together so that they form a straight line. They will have horizontal wrinkles across their forehead and in between their eyebrows, you'll be able to see the whites of their eyes above the iris but not below the iris, their mouth will be slightly open, and their upper and lower eyelids will be raised.

The final micro-expression is surprise. Someone who is surprised will briefly drop their jaw, consequently opening their mouth—but their mouth will not be tensed and their lips will not be drawn back. Their eyebrows will be curved and raised, the whites of their eyes will show, and they will have wrinkles across their forehead.

Posture, on the other hand, is a far more musco-skeletal exercise than facial expressions are. The body's alignment and position at any given time, or one's posture, is a great tool for gaining insight into the "default" state of somebody's body. For example, someone who has a forward head and neck posture more than likely has an office job which sees them sitting hunched over in front of a computer screen for most of the day. Posture may also tell you how someone is feeling:

- Someone displaying approach tendencies (i.e. someone who is hovering over you or invading your personal space) is probably angry, while someone with avoidance tendencies (i.e. someone who backs off from you) is more than likely feeling fearful.
- Someone who is sitting all the way back in their chair, nodding along and leaning forward, is probably open and receptive to the person speaking to him or her.
- Someone who is sitting with their arms and legs crossed, and who is tapping their foot or twiddling their

thumbs, is probably withdrawn and disinterested in the conversation.

- Someone who is leaning slightly toward you during a conversation is probably enjoying the chat, while someone who leans away from you probably is not.
- Someone who is enjoying their conversation with you will start to mimic your own gestures and posture. Someone who does not do this is probably either not enjoying the conversation, or is only pretending to enjoy the conversation because convention dictates that they must.
- During a pleasant conversation, the two people's bodies are usually turned towards each other at a slight angle. Someone who faces you head-on while in conversation with you is probably being confrontational.
- When someone is stressed, their posture will be rigid and their muscles will be tense. Their breathing will most likely be shallow, and characterized by a heaving chest rather than breathing through the abdomen.
- Someone who is tired will have shoulders that droop, and their head will be tilted downward, left or right.
- Someone who is feeling confident will have a more upright posture than someone who is feeling insecure.

Posture can also indicate social status. It is usually easy to spot the person of higher status when observing a conversation between two people, because they will assume a more relaxed posture than their conversational counterpart. The person of lower status will also likely have their hands at their sides or place them in their lap. A person of higher status is more inclined to sit down during conversation, while the person of lower status will probably stand or remain standing until asked to sit by the person of higher social status.

Oculesics is the study of eye contact and eye movement as a part of body language. Paul Ekman first described a handful of basic emotions, and their corresponding eye characteristics (Egolf and Chester, 2002), and theorized that the following could be surmised by observing someone's eyes:

- Someone who is anxious will likely have wetter or moist eyes.
- Someone whose eyes are stretched open is probably surprised.
- Someone whose eyes are glaring and stretched open is ostensibly angry.
- Someone who drops their head and diverts their gaze downward is likely feeling ashamed.
- Someone whose eyes are glassy or whose eyes are focused elsewhere is probably bored.
- Someone who is teary, whose gaze is averted downward, or whose eyes look tired is feeling sad.
- Someone whose eyes are wide and whose pupils are dilated is likely experiencing desire.
- Someone whose gaze is heavy and whose eyes are moist are feeling pity.
- Someone who rapidly averts their gaze is disgusted.
- Someone who is squinting slightly and whose gaze is intense is probably interested in the topic at hand.
- If someone glares at you, they are likely feeling envious of you.
- Someone who has wrinkles at the corner of their eyes and a "sparkle" in their eye is ostensibly feeling happy.
- Someone who is feeling fearful may have their eyes closed, or may avert their gaze downward.

Eye movement is equally as revealing as the actual appearance of the eyes. When someone looks upward and left while talking to you, they are recalling a memory; however, someone who looks up for a prolonged period of

time while you are talking to them is possibly tired of your conversation. Someone who looks down and to the left while they are talking to you is probably busy conducting an internal dialogue with themselves, while a person who looks down and to the right is probably busy internally processing an emotion. If a person keeps their gaze level, but looks to the left while they are talking to you, they are likely trying to recall a sound, while someone who keeps their gaze level but looks to the right is probably busy imagining a sound. If a person keeps their gaze level and moves their eyes from side to side while talking to you, they are possibly being deceitful.

If a person locks eyes with you from across the room and does not immediately look away when your gaze meets theirs, they might be interested in you as a romantic partner. If their eyes scan down your body from across the room, they are likely lusting after you, and if they stare at your lips while talking to you, they likely want you to kiss them. If a person looks you up and down, they are either sizing you up as a threat or as a potential romantic partner. Someone who fixes their gaze on your forehead instead of making eye contact while talking to you is likely bored. If a person is lying to you, they will either only make eye contact with you for short periods of time, or they will make irregularly long eye contact with you. A person who squints their eyes while talking to you is likely trying to understand something, or is making some kind of evaluation.

You can tell if someone is anxious by watching how fast they blink. The faster someone blinks, the more nervous they are. If you have someone's full attention during a conversation, they will likely only blink when there is a pause in your speech.

A glance is often just as powerful as full-blown eye contact. If someone glances at you from the corner of their eye and

slightly lifts one of their eyebrows, they may be attracted to you. Someone who glances at the door while talking to you likely wants to leave.

People often reveal how they are feeling through eye contact, too. Eye contact is incredibly important in the art of persuasion because you can tell whether someone is paying attention to what you are saying by watching if they maintain eye contact. If their gaze is elsewhere and they are not making eye contact with you, they are probably not concentrating on what you are saying. Alternatively, someone who makes very little eye contact is possibly feeling a bit insecure, or is perhaps even lying to you (causing them to feel uncomfortable).

Eye contact is a strange phenomenon in that we tend to make eye contact with those we like for longer; similarly, those who like us will maintain eye contact for longer, too. Someone who looks back and forth between your right and left eye is probably trying to sum up whether you are attracted to them. If a person makes prolonged eye contact with you that is done without blinking, while maintaining an immobile face, they may be trying to show dominance. If someone suddenly breaks their eye contact with you, it may indicate that they are uncomfortable with, or do not like, what has just been said. There is a special kind of eye contact known as making “doe eyes.” When someone makes doe eyes at you, their eyes will soften, the muscles around their eyes will relax, and their eyes may slightly defocus and appear shiny. This unique kind of eye contact usually signals that the other person desires you sexually.

Human beings are also prone to staring—more often than not, we stare into the distance, eyes glazed over, while daydreaming or pondering some internal qualm. There are, however, other kinds of stares that mean something a little different. If someone suddenly stares at you in the middle of

the conversation, you have probably said (or done) something which has shocked or surprised them.

Damp eyes, on the other hand, may indicate that someone is feeling anxious or has recently cried (inferring sadness). Eyes may also dampen if the person in question is tired or has not had a good night's rest. Someone who rubs their eyes while trying to talk to you is either trying to remove the aforementioned dampness, or is being deceitful and trying to avoid having to look you in the eye.

After you have considered the body language of the eyes, it is pertinent to also consider the body language of the eyebrows, which work in conjunction with the eyes. When someone lowers their eyebrows, they are partially concealing their gaze; this may either indicate irritation or aggression, or that the person in question is trying to dominate you. Raised eyebrows, on the other hand, could indicate surprise. If someone asks you a question and raises their eyebrows thereafter, they are probably expecting a swift reply.

Only a small percentage of people are capable of using their eyebrows individually, but it still helps to be aware of what it might mean if someone only lifts their left or right eyebrow. Someone who only lifts one eyebrow is likely feeling cynical or sarcastic. If someone's eyebrows resemble an inverted v, they are likely feeling nervous, concerned or anxious; on the other hand, a person whose eyebrows are pulled together to form a v-shape is either concentrating very hard on something, or is frustrated or angry. If a person's eyebrows are pulled together so that they form a straight line, this may be indicative of confusion; however, if their eyebrows are pulled together to form a straight line and the wrinkles between their eyebrows form a "u" shape (known as "Darwin's grief muscle"), they are probably feeling sad or

depressed. Monkeys, gorillas, and humans all quickly lift and lower their eyebrows to non-verbally greet each other, too.

Once one has considered the body language of the eyebrows, one must consider the body language of the forehead as well. Someone whose forehead is wrinkled because they have pulled their eyebrows up (and not just because of age) is probably feeling surprised or is questioning something. Someone who wipes at their forehead while in conversation with you is either feeling relieved or anxious about something. If someone slowly rubs their forehead while talking to you, it may be indicative that this person is thinking deeply or perhaps trying to recall something. If a person rubs at their temples, they are either experiencing a headache or are stressed about something. Someone whose forehead is sweating and whose eyes are damp is likely experiencing fear or trepidation.

We have now considered the body language of the eyes, eyebrows, and forehead—but the cheeks, despite not being as well known in kinesics, are just as important to understand. If someone touches their cheeks with both hands while in conversation with you, they are either experiencing shock or horror over something you have said or done. If a person is chewing on the inside of their cheek while you are talking to them, they are probably feeling a bit nervous or, alternatively, they are preparing to lie to you; however, if someone pushes their tongue against their cheek (making it look as though they are sucking a lollipop) they are probably trying to come to a decision about something. If a person's cheeks suddenly turn red while they are talking to you, they are either angry or embarrassed—on the other hand, people whose cheeks are suddenly drained of any color are probably feeling scared or fearful (or perhaps they are just getting a bit cold). Someone who sucks in their cheeks or purses their lips likely does not

approve of whatever is being said, while a person who blows out their cheeks is probably feeling a bit uncertain.

If you carefully observe how a person's mouth moves while they are speaking, you might also gain some insight into how they are feeling. If someone barely moves their mouth while talking to you, perhaps even resulting in them mumbling, it is possibly a sign that they do not want to talk to you, or do not want to discuss the topic at hand. In contrast, someone who moves their mouth a lot while talking to you is either trying to dominate you, or is excited about the topic they are conversing on. A person who very carefully shapes and enunciates their words is probably a perfectionist in general—and thus, you can expect resistance from them when things are not done the “right” way (according to them). Visual thinkers are more prone to speaking fast, while deep thinkers usually slow down their speech quite a bit.

The greatly under-valued and often overlooked chin also has its own unique body language, which can be a great tool if one can learn how to read it. When a person folds in their chin and tucks it against their neck, they are possibly trying to defend themselves by hiding one of their most vulnerable body parts (a habit that we have maintained from our prehistoric ancestors). Alternatively, if the person puckers their lips while pulling their chin back, they are likely feeling defiant toward whomever is addressing them. Similarly, if someone pokes out their chin toward you, they are probably challenging you. However, if someone is stroking their chin, as if grooming an imaginary beard, they are likely deep in thought.

About half of all of the chins in the world are capable of growing beards, too, and even these can be used to discern information about a person. A person with a full-on bushy, rugged beard possibly does not believe in going with the

crowd, or following the rules of society, and is probably not overly vain or self-centered. A well-kept, neatly trimmed beard is a different story altogether, and may just be indicative of vanity—or if not, at the very least an awareness of their appearance and a will to present themselves well to the world.

Watching a person's breathing can tell you an awful lot about how that person is feeling, too. Someone who is breathing through their mouth and who appears to be "panting" may be nervous or on the brink of having an anxiety attack (during which people often hyperventilate to the point of passing out). On the other hand, someone who is breathing slowly through their mouth, with their lips only slightly parted, is likely feeling relaxed and calm.

The next facet of body language to be discussed are the movements and postures of the head and neck (for one cannot consider anything pertaining to the head without considering the neck). You can tell any number of things about a person by observing their head and neck position.

- If someone tilts their head to the side, it indicates that they are interested in what you are saying or doing.
- If someone rests their head on their palm or fist, it shows that they are thinking; however, if someone does this during a conversation you are having with them, they are likely experiencing boredom.
- Someone who tilts their head forward while pulling their neck backward is feeling suspicious.
- Someone who lowers their head and gaze is probably feeling submissive.
- If someone suddenly lifts their head from a downward position, they are paying attention to what you are saying or doing.
- Someone who nods their head while denying something is probably being deceitful.

- A single nod of the head shows that the person is acknowledging what you are saying.
- Someone who nods during a conversation is showing approval, or encouraging the speaker to continue speaking.
- Someone whose chest is puffed out is feeling confident.
- Someone who over-extends their chest forward is likely trying to display a higher social status or is trying to appear confident.
- Someone whose chest is pulled backward is probably feeling insecure.
- Someone who places both hands over their heart is trying to appear sincere.
- Someone who rubs their chest is likely feeling uncomfortable.

Certain gestures (movements of the hands, arms, and body) can also tell you an incredible amount about a person. The study of gestures and what they mean certainly is not a modern phenomenon. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was the first to study gestures. He was born in 35AD and died in 100AD. In 95AD, Quintilianus wrote, *Institutio Oratoria*, a twelve-volume textbook on rhetoric in which he noted how one could use one's own gestures to influence others, as well as observing the gestures of others to surmise more about their motives or state of mind. John Bulwer published his book, *Chirologia*, in 1644. This volume was focused entirely on the study of hand gestures and their meanings. In their 2006 textbook, *The Definitive Book of Body Language*, Allan and Barbara Pease concluded a handful of gestures were universal and could be observed across all cultures—such as a shoulder shrug when the person was confused or unable to comprehend something, raising your eyebrows to greet somebody, and showing someone your palms to prove to them that you are not holding or hiding something.

There are two types of gestures: passive gestures, which serve to inform the person with whom you are communicating, and active gestures, which we use to communicate.

You can spot these gestures by being on the lookout for:

- Someone who crosses their arms is generally not receptive or open to whatever is being said to them.
- Someone whose hands are relaxed is probably feeling confident, while someone whose hands are clenched into fists is feeling agitated.
- Someone who wrings their hands, chews their nails, rubs their palms, or picks at loose skin on their fingers is likely feeling anxious.
- Someone who covers their mouth is probably feeling surprised or uncertain.
- Someone who walks or stands with their hands behind their back is likely feeling confident.
- Someone who makes a chopping motion with one of their hands while talking about something has probably made their mind up on the subject.
- Someone who is standing with their hands on their hips is probably energetic and eager for the task at hand.
- Someone who keeps their hands in their pockets while talking to you is feeling mistrustful and reluctant (unless it is particularly chilly outside).

Haptics is the study of touch, and what touch means in different scenarios. Fetuses develop a sense of touch at around seven weeks gestation, making it the first human sense to form in the womb. In 1977, Nancy Henley authored, *Body Politics: Power, Sex and Non-Verbal Communication*. She found, through careful research, that a person in power is more likely to touch a subordinate (for example, a pat on the shoulder) than a subordinate ever is to touch someone

in a position of power over him or her. Matthew Hertenstein, during his study, *Touch Communicates Distinct Emotions*, found that people are capable of surmising other people's relationships with one another by simply observing how they touch each other.

Proxemics is the study of interpersonal spatial behavior, pioneered by Edward Hall in 1966. He came up with the idea that certain spatial distances exist between people, which, when observed, can give insight into the relationship between them. If two people are in an intimate relationship (romantic partners), they probably stand between six inches (fifteen centimetres) and 18 inches (46 centimetres) apart from each other while conversing. Friends and family members stand about one and a half feet (46 centimetres) to four feet (122 centimetres) away from each other, and this distance keeps increasing as the relationships between people become less personal. Acquaintances, for example, stand between four feet (122 centimetres) to 12 feet (370 centimetres) away from each other when in conversation, while someone who is addressing the public is likely to stand around 25 feet away from them (760 centimetres).

Tone of voice is the next area of study when considering body language. People who are feeling confident tend to take longer, deeper breaths, and this affects their tone of voice, causing them to have a fuller, stronger tone. If a person is feeling anxious, their tone of voice is bound to sound weaker and thinner.

Chapter 8: How to Use Your Body

Language

Princeton psychologists Alexander Todorov and Janine Willis found that we only have one tenth of a second to make a first impression when meeting someone new. That means you only have a very brief moment in which to influence people's perception of you. When meeting someone for the first time, it is wise to have an idea of the attitude you would like to portray to others. A smile and good eye contact can go a long way, too.

Before deciding how to use your body language to influence people, you first have to ask yourself what image you would like to convey.

Most of us would like to project a higher social status and a larger degree of confidence, but how is this possible when one is not feeling very confident at all? Well, you can use your body language to give yourself a bit of a confidence boost! Whenever you are feeling insecure, place your hands on your hips and push out your chest. This is known as a "power pose," and although you'll look a bit like Superman doing it, you will also give yourself an instant increase in your testosterone levels, as well as immediately lowering your level of cortisol (the stress hormone).

There are other ways in which you can use your body to lower your cortisol levels. Rolling your shoulders back against your spine, relaxing your arms next to you, aiming your forehead and chest at the sun, and placing your feet about shoulder-width apart all signal to your body that it needs to stop producing cortisol, because you are apparently feeling confident. You can give yourself a mood boost by deceiving your body in this way.

Making sure that your body lines up with that of your communicative partner is another important body language trick you can use to your advantage. By pointing your toes, nose, and belly button in the direction of whomever you are talking with, you are showing them that you are truly interested in what they are saying and simultaneously building a rapport with them.

How you position your body can also be a deciding factor in whether you win an argument. Leaning backwards, or even stepping backwards to increase the distance between yourself and your communicative partner, is a sign of submission—and it will almost definitely lead to whomever you are debating thinking that they have won (at least to some degree). Next time you are arguing with someone, consciously lean in toward them when confronting them and watch how the entire conversational dynamic changes as you assert yourself as dominant.

When we are feeling a bit insecure, we tend to want to cross our arms. This is a prehistoric remnant that we have inherited from our ancestors, subconsciously trying to shield the vital organs in our chest cavity from attack. Crossing your arms can send others the wrong message, though. When our brains see someone with crossed arms, we immediately assume that they are disinterested or standoffish. You don't necessarily want people attributing either of these traits to you, especially not if you are trying to influence them.

Not making eye contact when someone is speaking to you can also make you come across as slightly aloof. You can avoid this by simply maintaining eye contact—just do not stare or you may make your communicative partner uncomfortable.

Your mother probably used to tell you to stand up straight all the time (as many concerned mothers have over the

centuries), but have you ever wondered why? Poor posture (i.e. slouching, hunching over) can make you appear anxious or insecure, even if you are not feeling that way at all. Whenever you are having a chat with someone you would like to influence, make sure you are standing up straight with your chest puffed out and your shoulders back. Exuding confidence makes it easier to manipulate people.

Even if you are really, truly feeling nervous, body language can help you to hide it (and thus appear more confident). One of the tricks to hide anxiety is to make use of hand gestures when talking to someone (somewhat like a stereotypical Italian might).

People tend to be more trusting of those whose hands they can see, and as you know, it is impossible to influence someone without first gaining their trust. It is thus a good idea to keep your hands visible when talking to a communicative partner. You can do this by keeping them at your sides when you are standing, or by placing them on your lap when sitting (or on the table, if you are sitting at a table).

You can avoid appearing nervous, even if you are, by becoming aware of the physical habits of those who are nervous (and avoiding performing them in front of anyone whose opinion is important to you). Nervous tics which let other people know you are anxious, and are advisable to avoid performing, are biting one's lips, wringing one's hands or rubbing one's palms, rubbing one's arms or cracking one's knuckles. All of these motions let whomever is observing you know that you are feeling insecure.

Another way to appear more confident than you actually feel is to be the first person to step forward and stick out their hand when initiating a handshake.

Dale Carnegie, who was born in 1888 and died in 1955, wrote in his book, *The Quick and Easy Way to Effective Speaking*, about the “triple nod”—a highly effective signal that you can send to someone using your body language. The triple nod is essentially three quick nods, given in rapid succession, that signals to whomever you are talking to that you are interested and want them to continue speaking. This method will encourage people to open up to you (a valuable outcome in the art of covert manipulation).

It is important to smile, too, but not all of the time. In his recent study, Timothy Ketelaar found that people in power are less likely to smile than their subordinates, but there is a trick to this. Powerful people might not smile often, but they know *when* to smile. The most important points during which one should smile is when greeting someone, when shaking someone’s hand, and when talking about something that you are passionate about. Smiling too often, or at inopportune moments, can make you look over-eager, denoting a lower social status.

Chapter 9: The History of Hypnosis

The word “hypnosis” first appeared in the English language during the nineteenth century, but hypnosis itself is much, much older than that.

Patricia Lionel, in her book *Mysteries and Secrets of Voodoo* , hypothesized that humanity’s use of hypnosis goes back thousands of years. Will Durrant, who was born quite a long time before Lionel, theorized that the first hypnosis took place in Hindu and Egyptian temples (though they also existed in Greece and the Middle East). These places of worship were called “sleep temples” and first started popping up about four thousand years ago. Sleep temples were like hospitals for sick people, except instead of receiving medicine or having surgery performed on them, these patients were put into a trance-like state by a priest or priestess, during which the priest or priestess would attempt to interpret their dreams in order to gain insight into whatever was ailing them.

Avicenna, a philosopher who was born in 980AD, was the first to draw a distinction between hypnosis and sleep. He did so in *The Book of Healing*, which was first published in 1027AD.

Even the Jewish religion has hypnotic rituals ostensibly written into its religious texts. Some Jewish people believe that by chanting and focusing on the Hebrew letters which spell God’s name, they can reach a state of spiritual ecstasy known as Kavanah.

Modern hypnosis largely evolved from the work of the early mesmerists and magnetists. Paracelsus, who was born in the fifteenth century, was the first doctor to treat his patients by passing magnets over their bodies, and was thus the first magnetist. He was succeeded by Valentine Greatrakes (who

lived during the seventeenth century) and Father Maximilian Hell (who lived during the eighteenth century). But the magnetists were soon replaced by the mesmerists.

Frank Mesmer caused the rest of the world to sit up and take note of the concept of hypnotism after his studies on animal magnetism proved that there was some truth to the notion of being able to induce suggestive states in animals. Mesmer was interested in the effect of magnets on the blood of living beings, and conducted many experiments to this effect. He lent his name to the entire movement that followed, and thus the mesmerists were born. Mesmerism was highly fashionable during the French Revolution, and Abbe Faria, a Catholic monk, definitely saw a gap in the market. Faria, unlike Mesmer, did not believe that hypnosis was simply animal magnetism which could physically be influenced by actual magnets, but rather that a hypnotic state could be reached because of the suggestibility of the human mind.

The next great contributor to the field of mesmerism was the Marquis of Puysegur, who was born in 1751. The Marquis termed the state-like trance which he induced in his patients “artificial somnambulism”—a term which is still used today. In 1785, the Marquis gave a speech at a local Masonic society in which he said on hypnotism:

“I believe in the existence within myself of a power,
From this belief derives my will to exert it.

The entire doctrine of animal magnetism is contained in the two words: believe and want.

I believe that I have the power to set into action the vital principle of my fellow-men;

I want to make use of it; this is all my science and all my means.

Believe and want sirs, and you will do as much as I.”

In 1842, a physician named James Braid wrote *Practical Essay on the Curative Agency of Neuro-Hypnotism*. He coined the term “hypnotism” in this famous treatise, and was also the first person to write a book on hypnotism. This book, *Neurypnology*, was first published in 1843. Braid disagreed with the mesmerists, especially on the existence of a special force called “animal magnetism.” He realized that if a person focused their eyes on a bright, moving object, it would essentially tire out certain parts of their brains, causing the person to fall into what Braid called a “nervous sleep.”

The first large-scale application of hypnosis for medical use occurred during the American Civil War (which was waged between 1861 and 1865). Field doctors did not have chloroform, ether, or any other form of chemical anaesthesia at the time—thus, surgeries and amputations were performed after the presiding field doctor had induced a trance-like, hypnotic state in the patient. This practice soon fell by the wayside with the development of modern anaesthesia.

Jean-Martin Charcot, a psychiatrist who lived in the nineteenth century, used hypnosis to treat patients who suffered from hysteria, with his student, Pierre Janet, having coined the term “disassociation” to describe the split of consciousness which occurs when a person enters a trance-like, hypnotic state.

Sigmund Freud was a student of Charcot, and would not have developed “psychoanalysis” had Charcot not exposed him to hypnotism during his academic career.

A French pharmacist named Émile Coué turned everything on its head a second time during the twentieth century. Coué, like Braid, did not believe in animal magnetism, and soon developed his own hypnotic technique coined the “Coué Method,” which involved chanting self-affirming

mantras. Coué was the inspiration for any number of modern self-help authors.

Clark Hull, an experimental psychologist who lectured at Harvard University during the 1920s, has often been called the father of modern hypnotism. The studies he conducted conclusively proved that there was no connection between hypnosis and sleep.

Andrew Salter was the founder of conditioned reflex therapy. This was a primitive type of behavior therapy which emphasized imbibing dominant and expressive behavior as a way to improve oneself. In the 1940s, Salter restructured modern hypnotism when he combined hypnosis with Ivan Pavlov's classical conditioning.

Salter's boom was too early to meet the approval of the Catholic church, however. It was only in 1956 that Pope Pius XII finally unbanned the use of hypnosis for practicing Roman Catholics (for medical purposes, not for recreational purposes).

The United Kingdom's first hypnotherapist was a man named Bob Neill, born in 1929. Neill was responsible for authoring the *Practical Hypnotherapy* series in 1994 and 1997 respectively.

Chapter 10: How to Make Use of Hypnosis

As explained, you need someone's full attention if you want to be able to hypnotize them. Keeping this in mind, there are a number of different techniques you can use to hypnotize someone covertly while you are in conversation with them. These techniques will help you to put someone into a hypnotic trance. Once in this trance, you can give your subject "commands"—commands they will comply with, if they are suggestible.

The first hypnosis technique is known as pattern interrupt. Human beings are a bit like computers. When a computer comes across faulty coding or an unexpected command, it may fall into a "loop." The human mind operates much the same way. Our brains like to run through familiar patterns or rituals, and when they encounter something unexpected in the middle of either, a state of confusion ensues. It is during this state of confusion that the person is vulnerable to any commands which may be given. An example of how to conduct a pattern interrupt is as follows: When someone stretches out their hand to give you a handshake, step forward and instead of taking their hand, place your palm flat on their chest. This will confuse the person, giving you a few seconds during which you can give them commands.

The second covert hypnosis technique does not feel very much like hypnosis at all. It is fairly untheatrical, but incredibly effective. Some call this the "imagine method," and it really just involves the use of the word 'imagine.' For example, if you were trying to urge a romantic partner to take a job offer, you might say: "Imagine how our lifestyles would improve if you took the job." In asking the person to

picture this possibility, you are engaging the visual part of their brain—making it far easier for you to influence them. The imagine method may leave your communicative partner believing that they have made up their own mind, when you have actually made it up for them.

The next hypnotic technique is known as the Zeigarnik Effect. This technique is similar to a pattern interrupt because both only function if they confuse your communicative partner (even if it is just temporarily). The Zeigarnik Effect's premise is that the human brain desperately longs for completion. If something is left incomplete, the mind gets "stuck" while trying to mentally finish whatever has been left undone. While the mind is "stuck" like this, the hypnotist can give the subject commands or insert suggestions into their subconscious mind. If you would like to make use of this effect, you can start testing it out by telling your friend a very detailed, intriguing story. Mid-way through the story, stop for a few seconds. The moment of silence that follows is the moment in which you need to implant suggestions or commands into your subject's mind. Once again, it is the confusion created which puts the subject into a trance-like state.

You can even put a communicative partner into a full-blown, unconscious trance without ever touching them. This looks a bit like the stage hypnotism you may have seen before. To do this, approach the person you would like to hypnotize and engage them in conversation. Keep the discussion lively for a few moments before starting to yawn and telling your communicative partner how tired you are. From here on out, you need to observe their behavior. Keep mentioning how tired you are, and watch as they become sleepier and sleepier. Once they are quite drowsy, you can sneak in the "sleep" command. You can do this by saying something like, "Keep feeling like that once you are asleep." Without too much repetition, your communicative partner should fall

unconscious (make sure you catch them). In this state, they should be highly suggestible. You will be able to wake them simply by commanding them to wake up again.

Of course, other people are not the only ones who you are capable of hypnotizing. You can hypnotize yourself, too. Self-hypnosis can be incredibly useful if you are trying to stop smoking or to lose weight. The most simple way to hypnotize yourself is to sit or lie down somewhere comfortable and close your eyes. Once you have closed your eyes, start focusing on your head until you are fully aware of its dimensions and weight. After you have done this with your head, do the same with your neck and shoulders—working your way down until you eventually reach your toes. Once you are fully aware of your body, you have entered a hypnotic state. In this hypnotic state, you can give yourself commands (for example, “I will stop smoking”) and you can expect to find it easier to comply with these commands after you have returned to your normal state of consciousness.

Conclusion

Whether you are interested in using NLP or manipulation, reading body language, or employing hypnosis to better yourself or to manipulate others, there is one characteristic which most increases your chances at success with any of the four aforementioned methods: confidence. It's really quite simple-if you don't believe in yourself, why should anybody shape their beliefs around you? Keep your confidence levels high by referring back to the postural tips and tricks in Chapter 8 of this book. If confidence is regularly an issue for you, you can refer back to Chapter 7 for some tips on how to "fake-it-till-you-make-it" in the confidence game.

Once you can successfully employ any of the above-mentioned techniques, it is important to consider whether you are using it ethically. Our ethics generally evolve from our own internal value system. Before choosing to influence another person in any way, it is usually a good idea to take a step back and ask yourself whether you would like to be in your subject's position. If the answer is "no," you should strongly reconsider whether continuing on your current trajectory is morally valid.

If you are faced with a moral challenge and you have to decide on a course of action to take, there are a couple of questions you can ask yourself in an attempt to find out whether it is ethical to continue. Is it legal? Is the moral dilemma yours or your subject's? What are the competing moral values? And how will this affect my subject, and those around him or her?

Once you have carefully considered all of the moral repercussions mentioned above, you can confidently venture into the realm of NLP, manipulation, reading body

language, and hypnosis, knowing that you will only improve the world around you.

YOUR OPINION IS IMPORTANT TO THE AUTHOR:

If you enjoyed reading this book, and found it informative, please be kind as to leave the Author a positive and constructive review [HERE](#) . Many thanks for your support.

You can also find on AMAZON, Emilie STANTON's new book :

[KEYS to SELF DISCIPLINE](#)

References

- Boissoneault, L. (2007). *Mind Control* . Pegasus Books, p.Para.1.
- Lifton, R. and Olson, E. (1961). Explorations in psychohistory. New York: Simon and Schuster, pp.78 - 81.
- Lifton, R. (1954). *The Nazi doctors* . p.33.
- Taylor, K., Marienau, C. and Fiddler, M. (2006). *Developing adult learners* . John Wiley & Sons Inc, p.5.
- Dick, A. (1999). *Mind Control in the Cold War* . Adelaide, S. Aust.: University of Adelaide, p.421.
- Westervelt, S. (1999). *Shifting the blame* . USA: Rutgers University Press, p.158.
- Richardson, J. (2012). *An oration describing the influence of commerce on the prosperity, character & genius of nations* . Boston: Russell & Cutler, p.518.
- Fishman, S. and McCarthy, L. (1998). *John Dewey and the philosophy and practice of hope* . Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Robbins, T. and Zablocki, B. (1997). *Misunderstanding Cults* . p.96.
- Wedding, D. and Corsini, R. (2002). *Current psychotherapies* . p.127.
- Alexis, K. (2007). *Mind Control in the Courtroom* . p.9.
- Schneider, N. (2018). *Perspecticide in Romantic Relationships* . p.48.
- Delgado, J. (1956). *Tried and true? integrating active and reserve components* . p.371.
- Fogg, B. (2003). *Tiny habits* . p.31 - 36.

Stein, A. (2006). *Terror, love and brainwashing* . p.88.

Nlp.com. (2020). *What is NLP?* . [online] Available at: <http://www.nlp.com/what-is-nlp/> [Accessed 14 Jan. 2020].

Sciencedirect.com. (2020). *Cybernetics - an overview / ScienceDirect Topics* . [online] Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/cybernetics> [Accessed 15 Jan. 2020].

Carnegie, D. (2005). *Make yourself unforgettable* . Nightingale-Contant, p.45.

Simplypsychology.org. (2020). [online] Available at: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html> [Accessed 15 Jan. 2020].

Youtube.com. (2008). *John Grinder Defines NLP* . [online] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BYU7dkG6DtA> [Accessed 15 Jan. 2020].

Paykel, E. (1987). Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders: A. T. Beck. *British Journal of Psychiatry* , 150(6), pp.870-871.

Tam, E. (2006). Satir Model of Family Therapy and Spiritual Direction. *Pastoral Psychology* , 54(3), pp.275-287.

Fromm, E. (1987). Psychoanalysis and hypnoanalysis: A professional history and a challenge. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* , 4(3), pp.207-218.

Nlpu.com. (2018). *Robert Dilts Biography* . [online] Available at: http://www.nlpu.com/NLPU_RBDBio.html [Accessed 15 Jan. 2020].

Perdrix, S. (2011). Partial Observation of Quantum Turing Machines and a Weaker Well-Formedness Condition. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Psychology* , 270(1), pp.99-111.

Rogozinska, E. (2016). Neuro-linguistic programming for teaching and learning. *The Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education* , 9(2), pp.149-160.

Andreas, C. and Andreas, S. (1982). Neuro-linguistic programming: A new technology for training. *Performance & Instruction* , 21(5), pp.37-39.

Arnold, W. (1988). Neuro Linguistic Programming and Listening Behavior. *International Listening Association. Journal* , 2(1), pp.89-96.

Dušková, L. (2015). Deviations from the basic distribution of communicative dynamism as a style marker. *Brno Studies in English* , 41(1), pp.29-40.

Fornäs, J. (1994). Mirroring meetings, mirroring media: The microphysics of reflexivity. *Cultural Studies* , 8(2), pp.321-340.

Fischer, B. and Wiegman, I. (2018). Disassociation Intuitions. *Southwest Philosophy Review* , 34(1), pp.85-92.

Newlon, M. (2001). A novel mechanism of PKA anchoring revealed by solution structures of anchoring complexes. *The EMBO Journal* , 20(7), pp.1651-1662.

Rescher, N. and Robison, J. (1964). Can One Infer Commands from Commands. *Analysis* , 24(5), pp.176-179.

Lim, S. (2012). Pacing Mode and Minimizing Ventricular Pacing. *Pacing and Clinical Electrophysiology* , 35(12), pp.1509-1511.

Evans, D. and Lucas, N. (2010). What is 'manipulation'? A reappraisal. *Manual Therapy* , 15(3), pp.286-291.

Serruys, P. (2012). Are they really wolves in sheep's clothing? What to do with manuscripts and scientific papers coming from industry: from case reports to a worldwide debate. *EuroIntervention* , 8(2), pp.173-175.

Braiker, H. (2001). *Lethal lovers and poisonous people* . Lincoln, NE: Authors Guild Backprint.Com, p.56.

Babiak, P. (2019). *Snakes in Suits : When Psychopaths Go to Work* . HarperCollins Publishers, p.101.

Plendl, W. and Wotjak, C. (2009). Fear relief is neither sufficient nor essential for long-term fear extinction. *Pharmacopsychiatry* , 42(05), p.32.

Perloff, R. (1993). *The dynamics of persuasion* . Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum, p.26.

Selesky, L. (2006). *The compliance without pressure phenomenon* . p.11.

Brenner, A. (2007). *Women's rites of passage* . Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, p.63.

Psychology Today. (2020). *13 Things Mentally Strong People Don't Do* . [online] Available at: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/what-mentally-strong-people-dont-do/201501/13-things-mentally-strong-people-dont-do> [Accessed 18 Jan. 2020].

Healthline. (2020). *Psychopath: Meaning, Signs, and vs. Sociopath* . [online] Available at: <https://www.healthline.com/health/psychopath> [Accessed 18 Jan. 2020].

Kimsaeed.com. (2020). *Psychopathy* . [online] Available at: https://kimsaeed.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Beginners-Healing-Toolkit-Updated-3_2019.pdf [Accessed 18 Jan. 2020].

Ni, P. (1999). *How to communicate effectively and handle difficult people* . Edina, Minnesota: Burgess International Group, p.86.

Science of People. (2020). *Body Language: The Science Of Reading It & Understanding It* . [online] Available at:

<https://www.scienceofpeople.com/body-language/> [Accessed 19 Jan. 2020].

Encyclopedia Britannica. (2020). *Francis Bacon / Biography, Philosophy, & Facts* . [online] Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Francis-Bacon-Viscount-Saint-Alban> [Accessed 19 Jan. 2020].

All-about-body-language.com. (2020). *Expression of Emotion: Body Language Pioneer Charles Darwin* . [online] Available at: <http://www.all-about-body-language.com/expression-of-emotion.html> [Accessed 19 Jan. 2020].

Mead, M. (1977). Anthropological Research Services Merit Support. *Anthropology News* , 18(3), pp.1-13.

Ekman, P. (2002). Emotional and Conversational Facial Signals. *Otology & Neurotology* , 23(Sup 1), p.S106.

Freeman, D., Morris, R. and Desmond (1966). Men and Snakes. *Man* , 1(2), p.262.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages* . Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., p.55.

Study-body-language.com. (2020). *Posture and Body Language* . [online] Available at: <http://www.study-body-language.com/Posture-and-body-language.html> [Accessed 19 Jan. 2020].

Egolf, D. and Chester, S. (2002). *The Nonverbal factor* . p.92.

Psychologistworld.com. (2020). *How To Read Anyone's Body Language Using Eye Signals* . [online] Available at: <https://www.psychologistworld.com/body-language/eyes> [Accessed 19 Jan. 2020].

Changingminds.org. (2020). *Eyes body language* . [online] Available at:

http://changingminds.org/techniques/body/parts_body_language/eyes_body_language.htm [Accessed 20 Jan. 2020].

NLP Mentor. (2020). *Eye Body Language - Knowing What People are Thinking* . [online] Available at: <http://nlp-mentor.com/eye-body-language/> [Accessed 20 Jan. 2020].

Study-body-language.com. (2020). [online] Available at: <http://www.study-body-language.com/gestures.html> [Accessed 20 Jan. 2020].

MacLean, K. (2009). Putting Haptics into the Ambience. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics* , 2(3), pp.123-135.

Ciolek, T. (1983). The proxemics lexicon: A first approximation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* , 8(1), pp.55-79.

Said, C., Sebe, N. and Todorov, A. (2009). "Structural resemblance to emotional expressions predicts evaluation of emotionally neutral faces": Correction to Said, Sebe, and Todorov (2009). *Emotion* , 9(4), p.509.

Lee Adams, W. (2017). Try a power pose. *New Scientist* , 234(3131), pp.24-25.

Sucre, G. (1972). The body of language and the language of the body. *Review: Literature and Arts of the Americas* , 5(6), pp.11-14.

Yang Eun Sook (2017). The Analysis of Body Language presented in Physical Theatre: Applying the Type of the Body Language Classified by Ekman & Friesen. *The Journal of Korean Dance* , 35(4), pp.251-276.

Pivetti, K. (2016). How to Win Friends and Influence Princes: Dale Carnegie, Shakespeare, and American Political Identity. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* , 16(2), pp.257-268.

De Cremer, D. (2007). *Advances in the psychology of justice and affect* . Charlotte, NC: Information Age Pub.

Gauld, A. (1995). *A history of hypnotism* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.13 - 34.

Crabtree, A. (2019). 1784: The Marquis de Puységur and the psychological turn in the west. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* , 55(3), pp.199-215.

Haas, L. (2001). Jean Martin Charcot (1825-93) and Jean Baptiste Charcot (1867-1936). *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* , 71(4), pp.524-524.

Émile Coué: The Man and his Work. (1922). *Nature* , 110(2759), pp.376-376.

Kihlstrom, J. (2004). Clark L. Hull, Hypnotist. *Contemporary Psychology* , 49(2), pp.141-144.

Salter, A. (1941). Three Techniques of Autohypnosis. *The Journal of General Psychology* , 24(2), pp.423-438.

Erickson, M. (1980). *Advanced techniques of hypnosis and therapy* . New York: Grune & Stratton.